CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL
of the Pacific

THE ANGLICAN

A QUARTERLY OF THE AMERICAN BRANCH
OF THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

WINTER 1950
VOL. VI, NO. 4

THE ANGLICAN

The Quarterly of the American Branch of the Anglican Society

VOLUME VI WINTER, 1950 NUMBER 4

The objects of the American Branch of the Anglican Society are:

1. To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer.

2. To uphold and appreciate the Anglican Use both in rite and ceremonial.

Membeship is invited on the broad principle of loyalty to the American Prayer Book, Constitution and Canons and the Common Law of the Anglican Communion. Apply to either the Secretary or the Chairman of the Extension Committee for membership. The dues are $2.00 a year which includes subscription to "The Anglican."

COLLECT OF THE SOCIETY
by Bishop Oldham

O God, Who art the Author of all good things in Thy holy Church, work mightily in Thy servants of the Anglican Society; direct and control our thoughts and deeds in loyal adherence to the heritage of our fathers that by our endeavors we may enhance the beauty and sincerity of Thy worship; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. — *Amen.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHRISTMAS HYMN ..... *John Byrom*
NOTICES ..... *The Secretary*
WHY ANGLICANS REJECT THE ASSUMPTION ..... *Archbishop of York*
SOME THOUGHTS ON REUNION ..... *Holt M. Jenkins*
THE TITLE PAGE OF THE PRAYER BOOK ..... *J. J. M. Harte*
A CRITICISM OF PRAYER BOOK STUDIES ..... *B. Franklin Williams*
NOTES ON THE SERVICES: I

Christians, awake, salute the happy morn,
Whereon the Saviour of the world was born;
Rise to adore the mystery of love,
Which hosts of angels chanted from above;
With them the joyful tidings first begun
God incarnate and the Virgin's Son.

—*John Byrom*

NOTICES

The Annual Meeting of the Anglican Society (American Branch) will be held on St. Paul's Day, January 25, 1951, at the General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, through the courtesy of the Very Rev. Dr. Rose, the Dean of the Seminary. The Executive Committee will meet at 2.30 p. m. and the general meeting will be held in Seabury Hall at 4.00 p. m. To this meeting all our members with their friends are cordially invited. At 4.45 p. m. an address will be given by the Rev. Dr. William H. Dunphy, Rector of St. Mark's Parish, Philadelphia. At 6.00 p. m. the members will attend the Choral Evensong in the Seminary Chapel.

* * * * *

More funds are needed by the Society. It is true we have paid off a large debt due *The English Catholic* and that our only endebtedness is for this issue of the *Anglican*, about $115.00. We need an extra $100.00 in the treasury after paying our bills. Could each of our members secure one new member? or if that cannot be done, will he send our treasurer, Mr. Lackmann, a small sum, $1.00 or $2.00 or $5.00 or $10.00? This would help very much.

* * * * *

The illustration on the cover of *The Anglican* is of the altar in the Side Chapel at St. Mary's, Dover, England, which was designed by the late Mr. F. E. Howard and executed by the Warham Guild of London. The Warham Guild graciously loaned us the block from which the illustration was made. We appreciate this courtesy very much.

* * * * *

The Editor regrets that he cannot, for lack of space, print the concluding section of "The Altar" by the late Rev. F. W. Fitts in this issue. Part I appeared in the last issue. Part II will be printed in the March issue.

* * * * *

Interesting indeed must have been the Liturgical Day held at St. George's Church, New York, in which its congregation and that of St. Ignatins Church participated. In the morning there was a "Solemn celebration of the Holy Eucharist," attended by a vast congregation (over 1,000), at which many communicants received. Among details to please Anglican Churchmen were these mentioned, the offertory procession, only two candles on the altar, and the quiet dignity and reverence of the service.

May we not have more of this kind of service? Doubtless now there are several priests who could come to various parishes and direct them. Why not so observe the Feast of the Epiphany, the Ascension Day, Whitsunday?

WHY ANGLICANS REJECT THE ASSUMPTION

Wise words were spoken by the Archbishop of York in his Presidential Address October 12th to the Convocation of York. They were spoken because the Pope of Rome had announced that on All Saints Day he would, by exercise of his "infallibility," pronounce as an article of faith that not only the soul but the body of the Blessed Virgin had been assumed into Heaven. *The Guardian* of October 13th gives the address from part of which we quote the following:

"Our Church has always honoured the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of Our Lord and calls for our reverence, gratitude and affection towards her; but it cannot accept a dogma which has neither scriptural, historical, nor doctrinal foundation. No *scriptural* support can be found for belief in the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, for the New Testament is silent about her death and burial. There is no *historical* evidence, for, with the exception of an apocryphal book condemned by Pope Gelasius, there is no statement about it until the end of the sixth century. There is no *patristic* support, for, again with one possible exception, there is no reference to it in the writings of the Fathers for the first six centuries. There is no *doctrinal* support except a doubtful logical deduction from the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin which itself has neither scriptural nor historical basis; the belief that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from all stain of original sin only took definite shape in the twelfth century; it was not until the fourteenth century that it was defended by leading theologians against the opposition of the Dominicans and others; it only became a dogma of faith in 1854.

"Some may consider that the promulging of the doctrine of the bodily Assumption of Our Lady concerns only the Roman Catholic Church, and that it is unseemly for those who are not its members to criticize. But Christians outside the Roman Church deeply regret it, for it raises another obstacle to Christian unity at the very time when the dangers of our day should bring all Christians closer. They regret it because in those countries where Roman Catholicism is often the only alternative to atheism, educated men on the threshold of the faith may withdraw from it rather than accept a dogma which their reason rejects. They regret it also because the claim that Christianity is an historical religion will be prejudiced if a pious belief with no shred of history to support it is treated as a fact of history in the same sense as the Resurrection of Jesus Christ."

SOME THOUGHTS ON REUNION

by the Rev. Holt M. Jenkins

The Church as a whole and its people are increasingly concerned about the matter of Christian Reunion. The word "ecumenical" is once more, and rightly, a part of popular Christian usuage. The time has certainly come to set about healing the divisions in the Body of Christ rather than perpetuating new denominations and sects.

However, much of the interest in and discussion about reunion does not seem very far removed from the level of expediency. A real and honest consideration of the issues involved would seem all the more necessary because of the urgency of the times and the headlong enthusiasm of many Christian leaders. It is also increasingly important because other Christian leaders seem unwilling to recognize that there is even a need for Reunion.

While it is certainly true that because of the character of our own Anglican Communion we have a leading role to play in this matter, there seems to be more confusion in our own ranks than anywhere else in Christendom. It would seem at the present time that our relations with other Communions are capable of varying from parish to parish. It does not seem to be possible in most cases to even secure agreement at the diocesan level. This is because some bishops and priests treat those from whom we are separated as if no separation existed. Others treat them with open and unconcealed hostility. Between these two extremes, there is much variableness and many shadows of turning.

Because of this, a minister of another Communion who assists at the Holy Communion in the parish of his Episcopal neighbor may be transferred to another town where the local rector will not even speak to him on the street. Allowing for a certain amount of exaggeration in this description, it is nevertheless no wonder that there are many who think that there are really two Episcopal Churches and ask if we belong to the High Church or the Low. Some of our own people make this mistake of thinking in terms of a division within our own Episcopal Church. It is hard for many non-Episcopalians to really believe that we are all one even when we tell them that no division exists. It must be most confusing when we present to the world such a divided front. All too often, we seem to be saying different things at the same time and contending that this is what the Church teaches. In so doing, we obscure that character of Anglicanism which can contribute so much to the cause of Reunion. Also in speaking as we so often do, we undoubtedly appear before the world as irresponsible individualists.

Let us consider some of the problems facing us at home with regard to our cooperation with other Christian bodies. First, is the matter of "open Communion." This has become increasingly a problem in the Church and

yet, the Church has been strangely silent about this question. The rubric at the end of the Confirmation service has been the cause of much discussion to which there has been no adequate answer. Historically, this rubric is the result of the English Civil War and the bitterness of the Restoration. However, it would appear that many of the Pre-Restoration Anglican Fathers would have disagreed with the rubric had it existed in their time. But the contention that this is a purely historical matter does not really alter the fact that it is a rubric of the Prayer Book. Presumably rubrics possess authority and require obedience.

Certainly there is no parish in which strangers do not present themselves at the altar rail and it is impossible at this point for the priest to question them as to their communicant status. Moreover, it seems natural and normal that guests should be treated as such and that visitors to our parishes be welcomed at the Lord's Table. Few of our clergy would refuse to communicate visitors who did not know of the existence of this rubric. Moreover, servicemen of other faiths are communicated by Episcopal chaplains in both the Army and Navy. Are they to be refused when they attend our parishes? It would seem that a certain amount of hospitality is necessary.

However, there are those who make use of the Sacraments of the Episcopal Church for long periods of time while steadfastly refusing Confirmation. There are some who are regular in attendance without ever supporting our participating in the life of the Church. Since we do make many converts, it is essential that some distinctions be made between guests and those who simply make use of us without ever committing themselves to the fellowship of the Church.

Also, invitations to "open Communion" are generally extended to "all who believe in Jesus Christ." This is a rather sweeping statement. It does not take into consideration the peculiar beliefs of some of our minor denominations. It overlooks those who deny any sacramental character to the Holy Communion or refute the idea of sacraments in general. It pays no attention to vague or unorthodox Christologies and doctrines or lack of doctrines about the Trinity.

We badly need an authoritative statement on this point. The best that can be done for the present, is to consult the bishop of the diocese and secure his approval or disapproval about admitting the unconfirmed to the Holy Communion. This method, of course, presupposes that our clergy are willing to obey as well as consult their Episcopal superiors.

The second matter of discussion has to do with ordination. There is much merit to the oft discussed and proposed method of joint ordination. But the question of representation is involved and must be settled before such ordinations can be held. Anyone who purchases a set of the Encyclopedia Britannica from a door-to-door salesman does so with the assurance that the

salesman represents his company. But if the clergy of other Churches take part in our ordinations without a previous agreement of the Communions participating, can we suppose that they represent their Churches? It would appear that if such participation is to be meaningful and helpful to Reunion, some agreement of joint ordination must be entered into prior to any such ordination taking place. It is meaningless for them to represent only themselves as individuals. In this connection, we need to consider the question of whether a priest or bishop of the Episcopal Church participating in the ordination of a minister of another Communion would represent the Episcopal Church. Would his action commit us to future joint ordinations? Certainly not without some action of the General Convention of the Church.

In addition to such problems as the two mentioned here, we need to carefully consider the whole attitude with which the work of Reunion is to be approached by the Episcopal Church. It needs to be said that those who are sincerely concerned about disunion and are working to heal the broken Body of Christ, take schism seriously. Disunity is truly a sin; a sin of the whole Church. The Reformers regarded it as such. Much as we may deplore their violent language, and still more violent actions, the leaders of the Reformation felt justified by their genuine horror of breaking the Church asunder. Since the separation of the Body of Christ is truly a sin, it cannot be lightly set aside. Penitence must be added to prayer and action.

However, there are those who are unwilling to recognize the existence, much less the sinfulness, of schism. How is the cause of Christian unity to be advanced if we behave as if it had already been accomplished? Acting as if we are all One Body does not make it automatically come true.

There is also an apparent tendency in our controversies and discussions to rob God of his part in the work of Reunion. Results are expected of him in this sphere which would not be expected in any phase of Creation or in acting upon the soul of an individual to cause him to repent. It is almost as if we had set up a time schedule for the Reunion of Christendom and are impatient that God has not met our deadline.

It is also true that many of the opponents of Reunion seem to lack any indication of a response to the activity of the Holy Ghost. Undoubtedly they preach and practice sacrifice as an integral part of Christianity. Undoubtedly also they have a sure and lively faith in the powers of God the Holy Spirit. And yet it seems that Reunion forms for them an insurmountable barrier which no amount of faith in the Holy Ghost and no amount of belief in the importance of sacrifice enables them to overcome.

We cannot really think about or approach Christian Reunion without a clear understanding that it involves performing the will of God. It must of necessity also involve some sacrifice on our part as well as on the part of the other Communions of Christendom. But the sacrifices must be made by the

whole Episcopal Church and not just by individuals. And the performance of God's will must be an act of the whole Church as represented by its bishops, General Convention and Lambeth Conference.

The argument will be advanced that those who act independently of the Church in matters of Reunion are pioneers. This attitude is at the heart of our confusion about Reunion just as it is at the heart of the liturgical confusion that prevails today in the Episcopal Church. It is perhaps a hard saying for many of our clergy to accept, but unless the agency of Reunion, as well as of liturgical revision, is the duly constituted authority of the Church, then we will continue to appear before the world with a divided witness and and an uncertain voice.

THE TITLE PAGE OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

by the Rev. J. J. M. Harte

The wording of the title page of the Book of Common Prayer has, during its four hundred year history, undergone change from time to time. It is interesting to observe what a difference a little rearrangement can make.

The 1549 Book of Common Prayer arranged the words to form a pattern on the page, with little regard to their meaning. This was a habit of the typesetters of that period. It ran like this:

The
Booke of the Common
Prayer and Admi-
nistracion of
the
Sacramentes, and other
Rites and Ceremonies of
The Churche after the
Use of the Churche
of England.

All type was the same size, and no phrase was emphasized above another.

The 1552 book, which was never sanctioned by Convocation, and which was practically never used at all, cut out the phrase about "The Church" and the local "use" making it read simply, "Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England."

The 1662 book, the one used in England today, returned to the standard wording, the same that is used in the American Prayer Book, but gave it quite a different emphasis by this typographical arrangement:

The Book of
Common Prayer
and
Administration of the Sacraments
And other Rites and Ceremonies
Of the Church according to the use of
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

That last line in large type, emphasizing the Church of England, almost extinguishes the idea of The Church.

The American book says,

The Book of Common Prayer
And Administration of the Sacraments
And other Rites and Ceremonies of
The Church

then, farther down, in different type, "according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

The title page speaks of "common prayer," "sacraments," "rites," and "ceremonies." The words are used carefully, in their exact meanings.

"Common Prayer," in one sense, might be used of the whole Prayer Book; but in a stricter and more limited meaning it applies to the daily offices derived from the Breviary; what are called "the Divine Office," or "Matins and Evensong," or "Morning and Evening Prayer." It would also include the Litany, the Prayers and Thanksgivings, and the Penitential Office.

"Administration of the Sacraments" is clear enough to need no comment.

The words "rites" and "ceremonies" are often misunderstood.

"Ritual," "ritualism," and "ritualistic" are words often applied to ornaments, vestments, acts, gestures, to ceremonial practices of various linds. That is actually an incorrent use of language. The words "rite" and "ritual" refer to the *words* of a service or sacrament.

The word to use for the accompanying actions, gestures, or other outward expression of inward meaning is "ceremony" or "ceremonial."

The ceremonial directions may be found in the rubrics, thus: "He shall take the child into his arms . . . and shall dip him in the water discreetly, or shall pour water upon him, saying . . ." (then comes the ritual) . . . "I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen."

When the title page mentions "rites" and "ceremonies" separately, it knows what it is doing; and while the matter is not of first importance, a real churchman should take pride in using his church language accurately.

Note that the title page does not say "all" the Rites. There are others in common use throughout the church for such occasions as the laying of a corner-stone or for other more or less rare happenings.

A CRITICISM OF PRAYER BOOK STUDIES: I

by the Rev. B. Franklin Williams

The Liturgical Commission's "Prayer Book Studies I and II," previously noticed in *The Anglican*, forthrightly asked for the comment of the parish clergy. This policy, which seems to be inherent in the nature of the Commission's work, is not only wise but virtuous, since it illustrates that very Christian virtue of humility. Its wisdom lies in the fact that it attempts to balance the thoughtful scholarship of the eminent members of its body with the amassed experience of the less eminent and generally less learned working parish priests. In the previous notice in these columns the editor pointed out that "the acid test . . . in worship in the church" is of grave importance in determining what should be acceptable as a change in the present text.

If this must be the test, then once the work of scholarship has been done, criticism of the scholars' proposals ought to come freely from every parish priest who is willing to lend his imagination, regardless of his qualifications as a scholar. It may be very difficult to evaluate these criticisms from what we may call "the field," but they must be heard if a future revision is not to come forth smelling too much of the lamp.

When one listens to clerical day-dreams about revising the Prayer Book, he often hears a series of words very much like those which introduce the present "Prayer Book Studies": the aims of the proposal are "to simplify, to clarify, to enrich"; and again, with special reference to the baptismal service: "to shorten, to clarify the rubrics, to simplify the text." A few years ago in such studies it was common to find the emphasis laid on the word "flexibility." These aims often represent tendencies of a time, of a particular generation, sometimes of a single man's liturgical hobby.

Whatever the values to be gained from the special, personal insights which such principles represent, we certainly confront the danger of lop-sidedness, the lop-sidedness of the specialist — even the liturgical specialist. And the danger must be avoided, lest catholicity be lost. The way to avoid it is the acid test in use. Of course, we have no authority to use proposed variants of the service, and I think that few will be anything but thankful for the fact. We are thrown back upon the use of imagaination.

But before a criticism of the proposals in detail is made, it will probably be wise to look carefully at the general principles of revision which the "Studies" sets forth. Today, the dangers of flexibility are all too apparent to most of us. Unrestricted "may" rubrics in any great number lead eventually to the death of liturgy, and the very liturgical idea of praying with the Church in all times and in all places. Just so, I presume to doubt the wisdom of the present tendency to shorten the services.

Let us take, for example, the complaint which the "Prayer Book Studies"

takes very seriously: that the combining of Holy Baptism on Sunday with the use of the choir offices or with Holy Communion makes too long a service. The proposed revision takes this danger of lengthening so seriously that it makes provision to drop a lesson and its canticle in the choir office at the discretion of the officiant; and then invites support for a scheme to omit the preparatory section of the baptismal service itself.

In practice, what does this mean? With the use of the present Prayer Book, the parish priest who announces that at the late service on Sunday there will be Morning Prayer, Holy Baptism and Sermon has outlined a service that will last almost exactly one hour. It may exceed that time, but not because he may wish to read the service carefully and intelligently and with due devoutness. All of that can be done within an hour's time with allowance of, let us say, twenty minutes for the sermon. If it goes beyond the hour it will do so because he preaches a considerably longer sermon than that, or because he permits his choir to perform an anthem of unnecessary length in order to justify its existence as a choir, or because he expounds at great length a series of notices, which anyone interested can read, and those who are not interested will not listen to.

In combining the baptismal rite with Holy Communion, the only rubrical proposal which is made is that it shall be inserted after the Gospel for the day, which seems a wise and proper place, with the recitation of the Creed immediately following. But the only proposal for shortening this combination is the tentative proposal for the omission of the preparatory section of Baptism, spoken of above. But if shortening is really necessary, if the congregation is really so intent upon bursting through the outer doors, if our times are indeed so effete that we can endure being holed up longer than an hour only in movie houses, why not omit the hymn before the sermon, or the sermon itself, or the announcements, and the tricky anthem, and the Sanctus done by musical acrobats?

When laymen complain to the clergy about the length of the service, too many clergymen of small imagination take them at their word. They think the thing that really troubles the laymen is length. It is not really that the services are long by the clock. It is simply that they are dull. It is dullness about which the complaint is made, and the laity are merely being polite, for they have watches in their pockets or on their wrists, and know the truth. The movie houses long ago offered proof of that to us. What is needed to meet their complaint is to have the clergy use their imaginations. The Prayer Book is not dull as it stands. It is the dreadful humdrum accompaniment that disfigures it in too many parishes that makes the performance of its services tenuous or lifeless.

In detail, then, let us look at the baptismal service as proposed. I am one of those who would deeply regret the excision of the Gospel from St. John

3. The arguments used for dropping it are: (1) that its significance is taken up in the rest of the service; and (2) that three alternative Gospels are too many, and confuse the laymen trying to follow the service progressively through the Prayer Book; and (3) that the passage from St. Matthew has proved itself in practice a thoroughly acceptable alternative for an adult Baptism. I should say that the third argument is a mere matter of opinion. In comparison to the Johannine passage it seems flat to me, whereas the emphasis in the longer passage upon the mystical significance of what is about to take place is of the greatest importance, something that ought to be made as explicit and as authoritative as only words of Our Lord can make it. The second reason, which is that three alternatives confuse the layman, does not seem very convincing as long as any alternatives are left. And the first, that its sense is expressed elsewhere in the service, is true, for one cannot speak of Baptism at all in the orthodox sense without touching this Johannine teaching. But that ought rather to recommend it, than to suggest that this passage be omitted. I am left to wonder whether a fourth argument, unmentioned in the "Studies," has not been the actually prevailing consideration: that is, that it is longer than the alternative.

Again, I would regret that the one-sentence supplications before the blessing of the font should be compressed into a single prayer. The response of the Amens, made strongly by a full congregation, gives to their recitation almost the quality of a litany. The suppression of that litany-quality reminds me of the XVII Century Puritan proposal, so intolerable to our imaginations, that the Litany itself be made a single supplication.

It is surely true that the Commission deserves every commendation for its attempt to make clear the meaning of the things said and the things done to the mind of the attentive laymen joining in the service. And it is quite true that clerical minds, trained in the special medium of their work, often do not realize how difficult it is for even an educated layman to grasp readily the technical language of the Prayer Book. But I think that the man who has difficulty grasping the sense of "regenerate" or "regeneration" will have equal trouble understanding "spiritual rebirth," or "born anew." In either case, no matter which phrase is used, it is necessary to explain what is meant to the ignorant; and "spiritual rebirth" conveys nothing very clear to the "educated" but ignorant layman. Every such term that is used calls for repeated explanation in sermons, but once the layman has heard the thing adequately explained he will listen with attention and respect for it to recur.

"Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation; sanctify this water . . ." Of course, you can say that same thing with smaller words. One can write it, "Listen to us, and make holy this water." And with practice, I suppose, the parish priest could learn to say it without flippancy, but I believe we should have lost much by losing the long Latin words, so full of

resounding dignity.

The Commission ought to be commended for the new prefatory rubrics presented in this service, for they are truly intelligible and usable and strengthening to the discipline of the Church. But why were the rubrics about Private Baptism omitted? Granted that they may leave the impression in the mind of some that house-baptisms at a family gathering are a perfectly permissible alternative upon which the Church looks with benign indulgence, but the old rubrics really do not say any such thing.

The principal Private Baptism rubric provides a means by which a priest may satisfy an adult convert to the Church whose Baptism in some other communion was without doubt valid, but the administration of which (as it often is in the Protestant communions) was so lacking in clear theological significance that instructed converts instinctively desire some kind of "regularizing" of what was done. The new proposal in the Confirmation service certainly assists in this direction, by clearly re-imposing the vows of Baptism in detail, instead of by general reference. But even this lacks the formula of reception with the signing of the cross. It is a thing which in itself does not mean anything as regards validity, but it is surely something for which we have struggled hard in the past, and sacrificed much.

The Church, I suppose, regards Baptisms by the denominations as Private Baptisms, since they are performed, not by the Church's clergy, but by those outside her authorized ministry. As a practical measure I have used the prescribed completion of Private Baptism for the small children of families that have been brought into the Church from other communions, with the deepest satisfaction given both to children and parents.

Granted that that was not the original purpose of the rubric, yet the famous Confirmation rubric (about admission to the Holy Communion) served one purpose in Medieval England, another in Restoration England, another in Colonial America, and still another today, where it is honored. This one may very well have such a great future before it, if we retain it, and its usefulness by no means be limited to the situation for which it was first devised.

Would it be wise to omit the provision for Conditional Baptism? There is no similar provision for Confirmation or Ordination, yet these are also conditionally conferred sometimes. The practice in both those cases is justified by reference to the baptismal rubric as an analogy. But if that should cease to exist, what then? Surely, it would be better retained. I am curious to know why the Commission dropped it. It is not mentioned at all in the comment on the service.

Again, the Commission ought to be congratulated for its careful correlation of the rite of adult Baptism with that of Confirmation, and for the rubric designed to promote their use in the same service. But though the

Confirmation service is intended to be used in conjunction with Holy Communion as well as with the choir offices, there is no direction as to how this is to be accomplished unless it is to be done in the whole series of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion at the same time.

Could the rubrics not be expanded to indicate where Confirmation ought to come if it is being administered with Holy Communion? Perhaps there could be provisions made parallel to the provisions for Ordination. The lesson from the Acts might very well take the place of the Epistle for the day, and the remainder of the Confirmation office take place before the reading of the Gospel.

Again, there is cause for congratulation because of the removal from the Confirmation service of the confusion raised by speaking of the "confirmation of vows" instead of the Confirmation of people. There is further clarification made by the use of the word "Confirm" in the prayer at the imposition of hands. No doubt, this kind of distinction will become more important as time goes by. The non-sacramental services of Confirmation, so called, are becoming more and more popular with Presbyterians and Methodists. The time does not seem far away when we shall be faced with all kinds of acts of religious profession, in all kinds of denominations, being called "Confirmation," and it is well that we make the distinction as clear as we can. The expanded and lovely form of the bishop's blessing of the people ought to be a magnificent addition.

But in the proposed Introduction to the Order of Confirmation, I would suggest that from a practical viewpoint very little has been gained. Virtually the same thing can be obtained by the use of Morning or Evening Prayer, with the lessons and Psalms provided for the occasion by the 1943 Lectionary. The "Studies" provide this Introduction with the remark that it is often inexpedient to use the choir offices for this purpose, without elaboration on that statement. By the use of a choir office all that is added to this Introduction would be the versicles and responses that introduce the Psalms, Venite at Morning Prayer, and the collects; the collects would be replaced in the proposed Introduction by the final prayer (good in itself).

These "pony" services add little to the liturgical life of the Church, and subtract much. The use of them tends to bemean the choir offices in the eyes of the laity, and to promote the idea that any other confection is "just as good" if not better. We often see similar make-shift reductions designed for "Youth Services," or for special occasions in celebration of one object of intercession or another. These psalm-lesson-hymn-prayer services give us nothing that the use of the choir offices cannot provide for quite adequately. The total gain by using them is a matter of three to seven minutes in time spent.

Baptism and Confirmation taken together are a part of that process which was anciently called illumination. The first part of that process consisted of the acts of penitence. It is represented in the Prayer Book by the injunction to prayers and fasting before Baptism, and the Catechism teaches that "repentance" as well as "faith" is a prerequisite to its due administration. However broadly we may interpret the "prayers and fasting" rubric, and however some clergy may insist upon auricular confession as the true fulfillment of its purpose, the fact remains that even among those who are most particular at this point, many of their adult baptisms and confirmations are done without it.

In our traditional refusal to require auricular confession as a sine qua non, perhaps some provision ought to be made for a penitential introduction for one or both of those offices. During my ministry I have used the Penitential Office immediately preceding the baptism of an adult. It appears about as useful as anything else in the Prayer Book for the purpose, but the introduction provided to Confirmation might well have taken this nature, instead of the one it has. (*to be continued*)

NOTES ON THE SERVICES: I

Advent to Easter

Church services are sometimes very dull and uninspiring and often this is because advantage is not taken of the wonderful richness and variety of Christian lore which is our Prayer Book heritage. A study of the Church Year is of great importance to every priest and real care should be used not to let observance of local and even national objects interfere with its orderly progression and teaching — these should take color from the services, not vice versa. The sermons generally should be appropriate to the season or the day. The hymns should be carefully selected to enforce the teaching of the season or the day. But the psalms and lessons *must be* those provided by authority, not selected by the officiant.

Advent

The color may well be the lovely English blue, so much more beautiful than the ugly reddish purple or the so-called violet often used. The season should be kept, not as a minor Lent, but with anticipation of Christmas for which it is an admirable preparation. It is helpful to have in each week at least one extra service, perhaps in the late afternoon or early evening, Evensong with Bible instruction or an address on Christian doctrine. Care should be taken not to anticipate Christmas by Christmas trees or carols, for that robs the great festival of much of its glory.

Advent Sunday

This is the Church's New Year's Day, one of the more important Sundays of the year. The note of expectancy, both for the anniversary of the First Coming of our Lord and for His Second Coming at the end of all things, is strong: —

Good hymns are: "Hosanna to the Living Lord," "Come Thou Long Expected Jesus," "Lo, He Comes with Clouds Descending," "Awake, Awake for Night is Flying," "Hark, a Thrilling Voice is Sounding."

The Second Sunday in Advent

This day, because of the reference to "the comfort of the Scriptures" in the Epistle, has long been known as "Bible Sunday". It is the appropriate time to preach on the Bible and how the Church regards and uses it and what it should mean and how be used by us. Sometimes it is a good practice for the rector to treat one book of the Bible in his sermon — outlining it and indicating its chief teaching.

With other Advent hymns, these are appropriate: "O Word of God Incarnate," "Lord Thy Word abideth," "Lamp of Our Feet."

The Third Sunday in Advent

The day commemorates St. John Baptist (in the Gospel) and is appropriate to the consideration of the Church's Ministry. Ember day prayers should be used for the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday following are the Ember Days which precede Advent IV, especially designated as a tune for Ordination.

The fine hymn about St. John Baptist should always be used: "On Jordan's Bank the Baptist's Cry."

The Fourth Sunday in Advent

The services should be very joyous, full of expectancy for the Great Festival of the Incarnation, but no Christmas hymns should be used. The Christmas greens should not be put up until *after* this Sunday, although when Christmas comes on Monday (as this year) this means decorating the Church on Sunday afternoon; this can be done if careful preparation is made beforehand.

Christmas Day

The color of course is the festal white. Care should be taken that the greens do not come too near lighted candles. It is a pity the Midnight Service, which has become so popular, has reduced the services on the day itself. If it can possibly be managed, there should always be Mattins and Sermon and Holy Eucharist, with choir, very festal, at 9.30 or 10.00 or 11.00 a. m. And

Evensong, plain, at 4.30 or 5.00 or 6.00, makes a lovely service, to which almost invariably a few worshippers will come.

Probably the well-known Christmas hymns will be used. Very fine are: "While Shepherds Watched," (Winchester Old), "Christians Awake Salute the Happy Morn," "A Great and Mighty Wonder" (Rosa Mystica), "Of the Father's Love Begotten."

St. Stephen, St. John Evangelist, Holy Innocents — it is not necessary on these days to change the color except for the vestments. The "purple" often prescribed for Holy Innocents is singularly out of place, white or red should be used.

Epiphany

Much should be made of this festival — a star to symbolize the star leading the Magi may well be added to the Christmas greenery, which should always be kept till January 14 and may be kept till Septuagesima unless the Purification *precedes* Septuagesima. Also according to good ancient usage the white colors may be used as long as the Christmas greens are in place.

Pre-Lent

The color is the English blue or violet. The season affords good opportunity to preach on what the Church means by Lent and how church people should observe it and the necessity, particularly in this era, of self-denial and fasting.

Ash Wednesday and Lent

The altar cross and the processional cross and such statues and pictures as may be covered conveniently may be veiled for Lent, not with the ugly purple things Roman Catholics use, but with a sort of unbleached linen, to represent sack cloth. This also may be used for dossal and frontal and vestments; the effect is very pleasing. For Passion-tide a frontal and vestments of a dull red (with black orphreys) are in order.

Maundy Thursday

The color is the Passion-tide red, unless the English blue is used through Lent; the color for the Eucharist may be white. The Eucharist (only one celebration if possible, perhaps at an early hour) should be celebrated (if possible) with choir and acolytes. The evening service may well be in the nature of a preparation for Easter Communion.

Good Friday

The color is the Passion-tide red, but the altar should be stripped of frontal and ornaments, leaving only the veiled cross. There should be no use of black hangings. Care should be taken that the Three Hour Service

does not crowd out more important services. Of course the Three Hour Service may be made liturgical, which would be a great relief to many who attend it — Mattins, Litany, Ante-Communion, a long sermon, and Evensong. In parishes where it is possible an order for Good Friday which works out well is: —

9 or 9.30 — Morning Prayer with address for the children of the parish.
12.00 — The Litany, the Ante-Communion, a series of three addresses, separated by intercessions and periods of silence.
7.30 or 8.00 — Evensong and Sermon. This service may be one of the most impressive of the year: it is especially necessary to have an evening service for many people can go to church only at this time.

Easter Even

The color is still the passion-tide red (unless blue is used). There should be no celebration of the Holy Communion on this day. It is fitting to have in the morning Mattin sand the Ante-Communion. Evensong may be at 4.00 or 5.00 p. m. (when the festal white is used, and the church is decorated, but the veils are not removed and no Easter hymns should be sung) with Holy Baptism.

Easter Day

There will be in most churches at least the early celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and of course a later one. But Mattins and Evensong should not be omitted. Mattins can easily be said a half hour before the Late Eucharist begins, and Evensong may be part of the Church School Festival.

Good Easter hymns include: "At the Lamb's High Feast We Sing" (Salzburg), "Christ the Lord is Ris'n Today," to the tune by J. D. Jones (New Hymnal 95), "That Easter Day with Joy was Bright" (New Hymnal 98).

(to be concluded)

Have any of our subscribers back numbers of "The Anglican" for 1946, Vol. 2, No. 2, and for 1947, Vol. 3, No. 2? Please send to the Editor, who could use copies of 'The Altar' by Fitts.

THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

The English Branch

President — The Rt. Rev. Dr. Walter Carey
Vice-President — The Rev. H. Adeane Byard
General Secretary — The Rev. G. B. Timms
Asst. Secretary and Hon. Treasurer — Mr. W. J. Butt
Editor of the 'English Catholic' — The Rev. A. W. Blanchett

The American Branch

Hon. President — The Rt. Rev. Dr. G. Ashton Oldham
President — The Rt. Rev. Dr. Edward R. Welles, Bishop of West Missouri
Vice-President — The Rev. Dr. J. Wilson Sutton
Secretary — The Rev. Charles E. Hill, Twin Oaks, Williamstown, Mass.
Treasurer — Mr. William D. H. Lackmann, Livingston, Columbia Co., N. Y.
Editor 'The Anglican' — The Secretary (provisionally), with the Rev. Dr. William H. Dunphy and the Rev. Frederick W. Kates, as associates.

May there soon be a Canadian branch! Several Canadian priests are members of the American Branch.

THE McCLELLAND
PRESS
IMPRIMATUR
WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.